

**R-E-M-A-R-K-S**

There are 35 claims pending in the present application.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify the characteristics of the claimed isolator. More specifically, the term "electrically" is replaced by "electromagnetically". This amendment is supported at least by paragraph [0018] of the original description.

Claim 29 is also amended to clarify the characteristics of the claimed isolation apparatus. More specifically, the term "electrically" is replaced by "electromagnetically", as for amended claim 1.

Claims 30 and 35 are amended to introduce the subject matter of claim 6 in order to overcome obviousness rejections.

The Applicant certifies that no new subject matter is added by the amendment

Rejection of claims 1-5, 12-13, 15-17, 30-32 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Royalty (U.S. 7,127,683) in view of Kline (U.S. 7,050,755)

With respect to amended independent claim 1, and in response to the Examiner's arguments, the Applicant submits that the claimed apparatus is not obvious in view of the combination of Royalty and Kline.

The Examiner states that "Royalty describes an isolator in the communication link adapted to electrically isolate the aircraft-certified equipment from the other equipment." The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner for the following reasons.

Royalty describes a "way to partition a display area so that non-certified source 30 can not be displayed on the entire display area (col. 6, lines 8-10)." A "visual indicator" also indicates when information from the non-certified source 30

is being displayed on the avionics display 20 (refer to col. 6-7, lines 11-3). A "visual indicator" and a "way to partition a display area" do not constitute "an isolator in the communication link adapted to electromagnetically isolate the aircraft-certified equipment from the other equipment" (emphasis added).

Still with respect to Claim 1 and in response to the Examiner's arguments stating that "Kline discloses a controller adapted to selectively interrupt communication between the aircraft-certified equipment and the other equipment", the Applicant submits that the claimed controller is not disclosed by Kline. Furthermore, Kline never discusses the applicability of his invention to aircraft-certified equipment. Kline is not in the same art as the Royalty and there is no motivation or suggestion to combine them to result in the claimed invention.

The Applicant respectfully submits that presently amended claim 1 is allowable over the prior art. Claim 1 is therefore compliant with 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as its subject matter is non-obvious over Royalty in view of Kline. Reconsideration of claim 1 is kindly requested.

In view of the above arguments, dependent claims 2-5, 12-13 and 15-17, comprising the limitations of base claim 1, are also allowable over the prior art. The Applicant submits that claims 2-5, 12-13 and 15-17 are non-obvious in view of the combination of Royalty and Kline. Reconsideration of these claims is kindly requested.

In response to the rejection of claims 30-32, and 35, the Applicant amends independent claims 30 and 35 to introduce the subject matter of allowable claim 6. The Applicant submits that amended claims 30 and 35 are now allowable over the prior art since the subject matter of claim 6 is deemed allowable by the Examiner at point 7 of the Office Action. Claims 30 and 35 are therefore non-obvious over Royalty in view of Kline. The Applicant kindly requests a reconsideration of claims 30 and 35.

Since claims 31-32 are dependent upon claim 30, which is deemed allowable for the above-mentioned reasons, claims 31-32 are also non-obvious over Royalty in view of Kline. Reconsideration of claims 31-32 is kindly requested.

Rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Royalty (U.S. 7,127,683) in view of McElreath (U.S. 6,401,013)

With respect to independent claim 18, and in response to the Examiner's arguments, the Applicant submits that the claimed apparatus is not disclosed by Royalty in view of McElreath.

The Examiner states that "Royalty does not disclose initiate at least one control operation on the non-aircraft data system. However, McElreath discloses a control apparatus adapted to receive information from an aircraft-based source, the information indicative of at least one control parameter, wherein the control apparatus is adapted to initiate at least one control operation on the non-aircraft data system based on the received at least one control parameter (see columns 1-2, lines 48-8; and columns 3-4, lines 57-32)." The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner for the following reasons.

In the passage cited by the Examiner, McElreath teaches "Laptop PC 102 then provides a display output on line 114, which is received by integrated cockpit display 104, which has been adapted, along with avionics display processor 106, to provide for the receipt of signals from an external source (laptop PC 102)" (col. 3, lines 61-65 and Fig. 1). McElreath teaches that both the avionics display processor 106 and the integrated cockpit display 104 receive information from the non-aircraft equipment 102. Contrary to the Examiner's statement, the communication between the Laptop PC 102 and the disclosed avionics display processor 106 does not go through a control apparatus.

Therefore, McElreath does not disclose "a control apparatus adapted to receive information from an aircraft-based source, the information indicative of at least one control parameter, wherein the control apparatus is adapted to initiate at least one control operation on the non-aircraft data system based on the received at least one control parameter."

For the above reasons, McElreath does not disclose the claimed subject matter. Claim 18 is therefore allowable over the prior art and reconsideration of the claim is kindly requested.

Rejection of claim 19-25 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Royalty (U.S. 7,127,683), and McElreath (U.S. 6,401,013) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Kline (U.S. 7,050,755)

In view of the arguments provided above in response to the rejections of claims 1 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Royalty in view of Kline and Royalty in view of McElreath respectively, the Applicant submits that dependent claims 19-25 and 27-29 are also non-obvious over Royalty and McElreath and further in view of Kline. Reconsideration of claims 19-25 and 27-29 is kindly requested.

Rejection of claim 26 and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Royalty (U.S. 7,127,683), and McElreath (U.S. 6,401,013) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Jones (U.S. 5,670,742).

In view of the arguments provided above in response to the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Royalty in view of McElreath, the Applicant submits that dependent claims 26 is also non-obvious over Royalty and McElreath further in view of Jones. Reconsideration of claim 26 is kindly requested.

In response to the rejection of claims 33-34, which are dependent upon claim 30, the Applicant reminds the Examiner that claim 30 is amended to introduce the subject matter of claim 6. Since claim 6 is deemed allowable by

the Examiner at point 7 of the Office Action, the Applicant submits that dependent claims 33-34 are also non-obvious over the prior art. Reconsideration of claims 33-34 is therefore kindly requested.

In view of the foregoing arguments, reconsideration of the rejections and objections of Claims 1 to 35 is respectfully requested. The Applicant believes that Claims 1 to 35 as presently submitted are patentable over the prior art, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Bjom Stickling

By: /C. Marc Benoît/

C. Marc Benoît (Reg. No. 50,200)  
Agent of Record  
Ogilvy Renault LLP  
Customer no. 32292  
Tel: (514) 847-4462